

To: Aran Felix, EED

From: Kim Sherman, DRA

RE: Form A test document errors, proposal for quality assurance

Two errors have been discovered recently (Reading 2.78B, Item 2 and Math 6.910A, Items 4 through 8) and are of great concern to us, primarily because we lose the field's confidence in DRA and EED.

The errors are with two field test items, which were never intended for AYP; because they are in error, they will not be included in the calculations for field test items. To better understand how this has happened, we have analyzed the editing and quality assurance procedures that allowed errors to appear in the final documents.

Late August 2009: An editing meeting was held in Juneau: Aran, Kim, Sevrina, and Sherri reviewed all tests, modified wording, and addressed errors in draft documents.

Early September 2009: Questions about wording or test items were brought back to Jerry for final determination. A spreadsheet was created to track errors and decisions.

Late September 2009: Sevrina incorporated all edits in Form A after the editing meeting.

Early October 2009: Marge reviewed Form A and Sevrina incorporated her edits. At this time, the difficulty in editing documents created in Illustrator led to the decision to re-create the documents in InDesign for the 2011 testing year.

Late October: Daniel Anderson from DRA reviewed Form A and Sevrina incorporated his edits.

November 11, 2009: Sevrina completed making changes per Marge's edits.

November 18, 2009: Form A was uploaded to the AK Secure Site for review by EED.

December 21, 2009: Sevrina and Kim exchanged emails about final edits going to EED. Sevrina and Daniel had finished the reviews.

December 22, 2009: Aran was alerted to the VF versions on the Secure Server for her review.

January 7, 2010: Aran submitted an excel spreadsheet "EEDReviewSecureDocs" with edits to make. Neither of the two errors we are currently dealing with were caught at this point. We exchanged versions of the spreadsheet for a few weeks, ending with V5-KS on January 19.

January 11, 2010: REA signed approving Form A test documents (with corrections).

January 19, 2010: Form A edits were completed and VF was uploaded to Secure Site.

January 26, 2010: Form A was uploaded to AK AA website for download by Qualified Assessors and Qualified Mentor-Trainers.

None of our proofreaders (Sevrina, Daniel, Kim, or Aran) caught these two errors. I've asked Marshall Pickett to proofread the test documents (he has 30 years of experience as a graphic artist/copy editor) and he caught both of these errors, as well as some additional formatting and typo errors (most of which were not caught by Marge).

The primary shortcoming in the editing procedures detailed above is that none of the proofreaders administered a pilot test of the documents. We believe that this step is a necessary component of proofreading complicated documents such as the AK Alternate Assessment.

For the Form B tests, we also need to have a more organized process in place ahead of time. DRA proposes the following procedures:

1. Internal DRA hard copy edit of Form B is edited in early May by Amber Ewers.
2. Sevrina incorporates these first round edits.
3. First round hard copy edits are sent to Daniel Anderson in mid-May; Daniel ensures that all edits have been made and then provides a second round of hard copy edits.
4. Sevrina incorporates these second round edits.
5. Kim reviews documents.
6. A pilot tester is chosen from AK (from the list of mentors such as Dan Kaasa or Coalette Watchus). The pilot tester prints and administers all Form B tests, making hard copy edits. This pilot test needs to happen within the school year, possibly early June.

7. Sevrina incorporates pilot test edits for final Form B documents.
8. Kim reviews and sends to EED.
9. Ask Mentors to review the final documents at Annual Mentor Training. (Suggestions: Divide Mentors into content groups of three: One person to administer, one person to take, and one person to record errors and glitches. Could be in grade level).

Each editing process (with documentation) also needs to be organized and documented more carefully. Following are some proposed items for a checklist that is to be completed with a date behind each item:

1. Headers (check for year).
2. Footers (check for dates and subject area).
3. Headers for individual tasks (each header matches the appropriate task number and name across both SP directions and scoring pages and SM).
4. Sequence of item numbers (each item is listed as 1 - n and each directions page matches the scoring page).
5. Scoring Protocol matches Student materials for task and item number.
6. Page layout.
7. Clarity of SM items / drawings.
8. Wording consistency within directions.
9. Scoring consistency within directions (directions of how to score match appropriate scoring, ex. partial credit responses).

DRA will create a spreadsheet in which each editor marks a check after completing the review.

Furthermore, editors are directed to go through every page of each test only looking for one item at a time. For example, they first go through all pages and check the headers. They then go through all pages and check for footers, etc. By editing the tests as a whole we think some errors were missed, so it is very important to focus on smaller (and the same) items each time through the review process.

All future test documents will be created in InDesign, which should also help this process. Part of the difficulty with the Form A documents was that each page had to be opened and edited individually; furthermore, the text was not formatted in

paragraphs but rather line-by-line and sometimes several text boxes were included within one line of text. This created more errors each time a page was opened for editing purposes.

In summary, the postmortem from Form A indicates that adding people and steps to the review process is not sufficient. Rather, the process needs to change entirely in three ways: (a) a pilot test needs to take place, (b) editing needs to occur with individual items being checked for each page with a checklist concurrently being marked (and dated) with multiple individuals having a formal exchange and double check, and (c) the software needs to be kept consistent using InDesign so that style sheets can be created and thus reduce attention to individual components of the test on a page-by-page basis.